

REMARKS

Claims 1-24 are pending in the application. Of the claims, Claims 1, 9, and 17 are independent claims. Claims 1- 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being deemed anticipated by Muller et al. (U.S. Patent Number 6,021,132.) That rejection is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested.

The Applicant's disclosed switch includes a reserved pool of buffers and a shared pool of buffers in a shared memory and pool select logic. The reserved pool of buffers is reserved for an egress port. The shared pool of buffers is shared by a plurality of egress ports. The pool select logic selects a free buffer to allocate from the reserved pool for storing data received from an ingress port to be forwarded to the egress port and deallocates the selected buffer after the data has been forwarded to the egress port. The pool select logic selects a free buffer in the shared pool upon detecting no free buffer in the shared pool. (See Applicant's Specification Fig. 2, shared memory (108) reserved pool of buffers (202), shared pool (200); Page 5, lines 22-27.)

The cited prior art, Muller is directed to shared memory management in a switched network element. The switch includes a common pool of memory (shared memory) that is shared by all of the ports in the switch. (See Col. 6, lines 60-63; Fig. 3A, shared memory (230).)

Muller does not teach or suggest at least the Applicant's claimed "reserved pool of buffers in a shared memory, the reserved pool of buffers reserved for an egress port." Muller merely discusses a common pool of memory (shared memory) that is shared by all of the input and output ports of the switching element. All buffers are allocated to ports from the single common pool of memory. There is no suggestion of a "reserved pool of buffers in the shared memory" as claimed by the applicant in claim 1.

Claims 2-8 are dependent on Claim 1 and thus include this limitation over the prior art. Furthermore the dependent claims contain even further distinguishing limitations. For example, claim 3 recites "a multicast pool of buffers in the shared memory" and claim 4 recites that "the pool select logic selects a free buffer from the multicast pool upon detecting an IP Multicast data packet received from an ingress port". Muller does not teach or suggest a multicast pool of buffers for storing IP Multicast data packets.

Independent Claim 17 recites a like distinction in terms of a method and thus similarly patentably distinguishes over the prior art. Claims 18-24 are dependent on Claim 11 and thus include this limitation over the prior art. Independent Claim 9 and claims dependent on Claim 9 include like limitations distinguishing the cited art.

Accordingly, the present invention as now claimed is not believed to be anticipated by or made obvious from the cited art or any of the prior art. Removal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) and acceptance of Claims 1-24 is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is believed that all claims are in condition for allowance, and it is respectfully requested that the application be passed to issue. If the Examiner feels that a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this case, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

HAMILTON, BROOK, SMITH & REYNOLDS, P.C.

By Carol M. Fleming
Caroline M. Fleming
Registration No. 45,566
Telephone: (978) 341-0036
Facsimile: (978) 341-0136

Concord, MA 01742-9133

Dated: 12/9/03